

FILED
LODGED
RECEIVED

MAIL

APR 25 2011

AT SEATTLE
CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
DEPUTY
BY

District Court - is
and made a mistake;
This case is the same
one since Feb. 2011 - and
a civil cover sheet;
Mr. Simonds is notifying
the Court - on this civil
cover sheet the stakes
~~and~~ have changed;
his complaints have
stated such and
notified the Court;
So this civil cover
sheet; shall do so;
on the amount;
amount; Demand;
Statement of fact;

Mr. Simonds
April 23rd 2011



11-CV-00360-MISC

Complaint -
C11-10360 RSL
amended and more;
U.S. District Judge
Lashile failed to
state the truth on
all complaints - this
case; facts - sufficient
U.S. District Judge
Lashile knows the law -
on all complaints;
alleging cases or more;
including Mr. Simmonds's
Statement - he is
using Dish Network
on all evidence -
stated on the first
Complaint, Complaint;
Feb. 25th 2011,
U.S. District Judge
failed to decide -
Complaint - Objections
as more; or answer
etc. Judge Lashile;

U.S. District Judge
Gashnik has failed
therefore to know a
cause of action exists;
as more; just another
delay tactic;

U.S. District Judge
has violated
Statute - Article
3 - Jurisdiction as
more; his order -
dated - April 12th
2011;

Appellant - or
Mr. Simonds is
Suing Suing Dish
Networks on all
Complaints evidence
cases; etc documents
etc. as more; more;
Statements of fact
823 P2nd 831, 840 -
material facts;
this Complaint states;

U.S. District Judge
Kashnik failed to
admit to case -
823 P and 831, 840
as more; material
fact; his order or
delay tactics April
12th 2011

U.S. District Judge
Kashnik has
demonstrated lack
of the law - the motion
ordered to Show Cause

This complaint states
he is using Dish
Network based on
all complaints -
evidence - documentary
etc. as more;
April 14th 2011;
Claim - 5th amendment
U.S.C.A. Due
process as more;

findings of fact,
and conclusions of
law -

all documents, evidence
cases; etc. Complaints
387 F 2nd 264,

667 F 2nd 953 -
Number 8 - demonstrates
claim; antitrust

All complaints -
demonstrate to sue
defendants Defendant-
discrimination - document
U.S.C.A. 47 153 (44, 46)
and claim, alleges,
demonstrates such - etc.

Sue defendants - on
fraud - 823 P 2nd 831,
840 - perpetuate fraud -
and cases - suing their
corporate veil - 47 P 30d
556,

U.S. District Judge
does not understand-
the complaint - any or all
this is fine;
however; Judge Lashik
should know facts
before submission to
Mr. Simonds, and
delay tactic or deny
delay Mr. Simonds
his relief; is not the
law etc.

Defendant is being
sued on the law
based on the law;
the complaint which
cites this case -
828 F 2nd 831, 840,
states as says:
material fact;
therefore Mr. Simonds
not convinced Judge
~~know~~ knows the law -
or more, demonstrates

he should be
assigned this case;
documents pg 5-
274 - notes on case^(s)
16, 19, pg-275, - 20, 21,
22, 24, - Judge's order
dated - April 12th 2011
and attached
documents as more;
evidence rules -
~~due process of law~~
Mr. Simonds's
demands for
judgment - 28-1361 -

\$400 million Dollars -
on April 29th 2011

When Judge has
concluded all
complaints or has
accepted the fact
on all complaints to
sue defendant - Dish

Mr. Simonds shall
cancel pgs - 274, 275,
which is the second
time - these documents
attached to - Complaint -
objection; - 1st time,
~~1st~~ Judge must prove
to Mr. Simonds;

and 2nd -

Judge must answer
this Complaint; - entire -
any delay, shall
prove fatal to Judge

nature of claims -

5th Amendment - U.S.C.A.

Due Process -

Mr. Simonds

April 15th 2011

Colorado Consumer
Protection Act
and document- etc.

- ① That defendant engaged in unfair or deceptive trade practice
 - ② That challenged practice occurred in course of defendant's business or occupation
 - ③ That it significantly impacts the public, as actual or potential consumers, of ~~defendants~~ defendant's goods, services, or property
- Pierce Corporate Veil-
719 P.2d 176 to sue
defendants

④ That plaintiff suffered injury in fact to legally protected interests;

⑤ That challenged practice caused plaintiff's injury;

969 P2nd 225, 226
number - 13;

Judge Lashnik violated
Doe Foo Process -
U.S.G.A. 5th
amendment - claim,
as more order -
April 12th 2011
April 12th 2011 - order;

Judge Lashnik violated
Federal rules of
evidence - 101, 102, 103,

201, as more
findings of fact and
conclusions of law
on all Complaints,
documentary evidence
and cases - etc
387 F and 269;

Mr. Simonds's objections
Complaint-document-attached
U.S.D.C. W.A. W.S.E.
which means - claim; as
more; Mr. Simonds
would like this document
returned to him, etc. more;
Mr. Simonds
4742 18th Ave. N.E.
Seattle Wash. 98105
April 15th 2011

Claim - above - 8-a-1, 8-a-2,
8-a-3; demand for
Judgement - April 29th 2011

regard specifically to social and private activities, Canon 2B cautions that a judge should not allow family or social relationships to influence judicial conduct,¹³ and Canon 5A permits a judge to engage in the arts, sports, and other social and recreational activities only if they "do not detract from the dignity of his office or interfere with the performance of his judicial duties."¹⁴ Other canons govern the related issues of disqualification and conflict of interest.¹⁵

The policy justifications for placing restrictions on off-the-bench activities generally fall into the following broad categories: (1) the need to avoid the appearance of partiality, favoritism, or other misuse of public office,¹⁶ (2) the need to maintain public confidence in the women and men who comprise the judiciary;¹⁷ and (3) the need to ensure that judges will not be distracted by nonjudicial activities.¹⁸

§ 10.03. — Appearance of Favoritism

The need for the judiciary to avoid the appearance of partiality exists even in the absence of actual wrongdoing or favoritism. In a democracy, the enforcement of judicial decrees and orders ultimately depends upon public cooperation. The level of cooperation, in turn, depends upon a widely held perception that judges decide cases impartially.¹⁹ This is one meaning of the frequently used phrase "confidence in the

A. A judge should respect and comply with the law and should conduct himself at all times in a manner that promotes public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the judiciary.

B. A judge should not allow his family, social, or other relationships to influence his judicial conduct or judgment. He should not lend the prestige of his office to advance the private interests of others; nor should he convey the impression that they are in a special position to influence him. He should not testify voluntarily as a character witness.

13. *Id.*, Canon 2B.

14. *Id.*, Canon 5A.

15. *Id.*, Canons 3C & 3D. See Chapter Five.

16. See *In re Morrissey*, 366 Mass. 11, 313 N.E.2d 878 (1974); Acheson, *Removing the Shadow Cast on the Courts*, 55 A.B.A.J. 919, 920 (1969); *Judicial Ethics*, 50 A.B.A.J. 840, 841 (1964); Note, *Extrajudicial Activities of Judges*, 47 Iowa L. Rev. 1026, 1029 (1962).

17. See Cribbet, *The Public Activities of a Judge*, 51 Chi. B. Rev. 78, 79 (1969); Hall, *Judicial Removal for Off-Bench Behavior: Why?*, 21 J. Pub. L. 127, 146.

18. See *In re DeSaulnier*, 360 Mass. 787, 279 N.E.2d 296 (1972); Kaufman, *Lions or Jackals: The Function of a Code of Judicial Ethics*, 35 Law & Contemp. Probs. 3, 5 (1970); McKay, *The Judiciary and Nonjudicial Activities*, 35 Law & Contemp. Probs. 9, 19 (1970); Stern, Comment [on Judicial Ethics], 19 Univ. of Chi. Law School Conference Ser. 17 (1964).

19. See Rifkind, *The Public Concern in a Judge's Private Life*, 19 Univ. of Chi. Law School Conference Ser. 25 (1964); Wright, Comment [on Judicial Ethics], 19 Univ. of Chi. Law School Conference Ser. 39 (1964).

- judiciary."²⁰ If this confidence were lost, the judicial system could not function. Should the citizenry conclude, even erroneously, that cases were decided on the basis of favoritism or prejudice rather than according to law and fact, then regiments would be necessary to enforcing judgments.²¹ Consequently, judges are called upon to avoid all activity that so much as suggests that their rulings are tempered by favoritism or self-interest. This is a prophylactic measure that goes beyond the need for judges to recuse themselves from cases in which they actually have a stake or interest.²² Rather, the goal of the policy is to prohibit judges from engaging in certain activities that are deemed inherently inconsistent with the appearance of impartiality.
- § 10.04. — Collateral Misuse of Office
- Closely related to the appearance of partiality or self-interest is the issue of collateral misuse of the judicial office. Although the integrity of the judging process may not be directly compromised, it is considered improper for a judge to take advantage of his or her position and title in order to advance an economic, political, social, or other interest.²³ Furthermore, it is considered improper for a judge even to appear to do so.
- It is true that such conduct does not always appear to result in unfair judging, but at least two aspects of collateral misuse do implicate the decision-making process. A judge, by obtaining a favor through the use of his or her position, creates the reasonable inference that the favor may be returned. Thus, the first issue is one of, at least apparent, partiality. The second aspect of the collateral misuse rationale is its relationship to the character or personal integrity of the judge. We expect our judges to obey the law, and misuse of office that amounts to a crime clearly ought to be disciplined.²⁴ A judge who cannot obey the
20. See *In re Fuchsberg*, 426 N.Y.S.2d 639, 648 (1978); Model Code, Canon 2 Commentary. *Id.* at 667 (Simons, J., dissenting). See also *Martineau*, *supra* note 7.
21. Model Code, Canon 3C(1) (requiring recusal in cases where the judge's impartiality might reasonably be questioned).
22. *Id.*, Canon 2B; *In re Foster*, 271 Md. 449, 318 A.2d 623 (1974); *Shilling v. State Comm'n on Judicial Conduct*, 51 N.Y.2d 397, 415 N.E.2d 900, 434 N.Y.S.2d 909 (1980), appeal dismissed, 451 U.S. 978 (1981).
23. Courts have condemned judges' business activities that were conducted from chambers (*In re Steinberg*, 51 N.Y.2d 74, 409 N.E.2d 1378, 431 N.Y.S.2d 704 (1980)), which otherwise involved misappropriation of public funds or personnel (*In re Carrillo*, 542 S.W.2d 105, 109 (Tex. 1976); *In re Troy*, 364 Mass. 15, 63-64, 306 N.E.2d 203, 230 (1973)), or which appeared to involve fraud or violations of the law (*In re Troy*, 364

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

Mr. Paul Simonds
King

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

4742 18th Ave NE

(c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)

Seattle Wash. 98105 Uhlcnowh

DEFENDANTS

Dish Network
Uhlcnowh

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant
(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys (If Known)

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- ☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff ☒ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)
- ☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant ☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)

- | | PTF | DEF | | PTF | DEF |
|---|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Citizen of This State | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| Citizen of Another State | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 | Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 |
| Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | Foreign Nation | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 |

IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

CONTRACT	TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
<input type="checkbox"/> 110 Insurance <input type="checkbox"/> 120 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 130 Miller Act <input type="checkbox"/> 140 Negotiable Instrument <input type="checkbox"/> 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment <input type="checkbox"/> 151 Medicare Act <input type="checkbox"/> 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) <input type="checkbox"/> 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits <input type="checkbox"/> 160 Stockholders' Suits <input type="checkbox"/> 190 Other Contract <input type="checkbox"/> 195 Contract Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 196 Franchise	PERSONAL INJURY <input type="checkbox"/> 310 Airplane <input type="checkbox"/> 315 Airplane Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 320 Assault, Libel & Slander <input type="checkbox"/> 330 Federal Employers' Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 340 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 345 Marine Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 350 Motor Vehicle <input type="checkbox"/> 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 360 Other Personal Injury	PERSONAL INJURY <input type="checkbox"/> 362 Personal Injury - Med. Malpractice <input type="checkbox"/> 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERTY <input type="checkbox"/> 370 Other Fraud <input type="checkbox"/> 371 Truth in Lending <input type="checkbox"/> 380 Other Personal Property Damage <input type="checkbox"/> 385 Property Damage Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 610 Agriculture <input type="checkbox"/> 620 Other Food & Drug <input type="checkbox"/> 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 <input type="checkbox"/> 630 Liquor Laws <input type="checkbox"/> 640 R.R. & Truck <input type="checkbox"/> 650 Airline Regs. <input type="checkbox"/> 660 Occupational Safety/Health <input type="checkbox"/> 690 Other	<input type="checkbox"/> 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 <input type="checkbox"/> 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS <input type="checkbox"/> 820 Copyrights <input type="checkbox"/> 830 Patent <input type="checkbox"/> 840 Trademark
REAL PROPERTY <input type="checkbox"/> 210 Land Condemnation <input type="checkbox"/> 220 Foreclosure <input type="checkbox"/> 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment <input type="checkbox"/> 240 Torts to Land <input type="checkbox"/> 245 Tort Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 290 All Other Real Property	CIVIL RIGHTS <input type="checkbox"/> 441 Voting <input type="checkbox"/> 442 Employment <input type="checkbox"/> 443 Housing/Accommodations <input type="checkbox"/> 444 Welfare <input type="checkbox"/> 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment <input type="checkbox"/> 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other <input type="checkbox"/> 440 Other Civil Rights	PRISONER PETITIONS <input type="checkbox"/> 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence Habeas Corpus: <input type="checkbox"/> 530 General <input type="checkbox"/> 535 Death Penalty <input type="checkbox"/> 540 Mandamus & Other <input type="checkbox"/> 550 Civil Rights <input type="checkbox"/> 555 Prison Condition	LABOR <input type="checkbox"/> 710 Fair Labor Standards Act <input type="checkbox"/> 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations <input type="checkbox"/> 730 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act <input type="checkbox"/> 740 Railway Labor Act <input type="checkbox"/> 790 Other Labor Litigation <input type="checkbox"/> 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act IMMIGRATION <input type="checkbox"/> 462 Naturalization Application <input type="checkbox"/> 463 Habeas Corpus - Alien Detainee <input type="checkbox"/> 465 Other Immigration Actions	<input type="checkbox"/> 861 HIA (1395ff) <input type="checkbox"/> 862 Black Lung (923) <input type="checkbox"/> 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) <input type="checkbox"/> 864 SSID Title XVI <input type="checkbox"/> 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS <input type="checkbox"/> 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) <input type="checkbox"/> 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609
				<input type="checkbox"/> 400 State Reapportionment <input type="checkbox"/> 410 Antitrust <input type="checkbox"/> 430 Banks and Banking <input type="checkbox"/> 450 Commerce <input type="checkbox"/> 460 Deportation <input type="checkbox"/> 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations <input type="checkbox"/> 480 Consumer Credit <input type="checkbox"/> 490 Cable/Sat TV <input type="checkbox"/> 810 Selective Service <input type="checkbox"/> 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange <input type="checkbox"/> 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 <input type="checkbox"/> 890 Other Statutory Actions <input type="checkbox"/> 891 Agricultural Acts <input type="checkbox"/> 892 Economic Stabilization Act <input type="checkbox"/> 893 Environmental Matters <input type="checkbox"/> 894 Energy Allocation Act <input type="checkbox"/> 895 Freedom of Information Act <input type="checkbox"/> 900 Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice <input type="checkbox"/> 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes

V. ORIGIN

(Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- ☒ Original Proceeding ☐ 2 Removed from State Court ☐ 3 Remanded from Appellate Court ☐ 4

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you sue:
U.S.C. 405

Brief description of cause:
Due POC

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

- ☐ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY

(See instructions): JUDGE

DATE: April 16th 2011 SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY: Mr.

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT # AMOUNT APPLYING IFP

Please choose ONE Nature of suit from the list above

Thank You

Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment

led in complaint:

Yes ☐ No